



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,156	09/10/2003	Michael Wayne Bricker	18013 (AT 20958-43)	3718

7590 09/15/2004

Robert Kapalka
Tyco Electronics Corporation
Suite 140
4550 New Linden Hill Road
Wilmington, DE 19808

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2831

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ALC

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/659,156	Applicant(s) BRICKER ET AL.	
	Examiner Chau N Nguyen	Art Unit 2831	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyasu et al. (2003/0205402) in view of Shoffner (4,892,442).

Koyasu et al. discloses a cable (Figs 3, 5, 6) comprising a cylindrical core comprising at least one twisted pair of insulated wires and a jacket surrounding the core. Koyasu et al. does not disclose the jacket comprising at least one spline projecting inward from an inner surface of the jacket. Shoffner discloses a jacket (Figs 3 and 4) for receiving transmission cable (see abstract), comprising at least one spline (20) projecting inward from an inner surface of the jacket. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the jacket of Koyasu et al. with at least one spline as taught by Shoffner to reduce the surface area contact between the jacket and the twisted pair (or the transmission lines, col. 2, lines 64-66). Noted that the feature of at least a portion of the twisted pair being positioned between the spline and the center of the core and the feature of the relative movement of the jacket with respect to the core being prevented are disclosed in the modified cable of Koyasu et al. since it comprises structure and material as claimed.

The modified cable of Koyasu et al. also discloses the core comprising a filler, a plurality of twisted pairs (re claim 2), a plurality of spline (see Shoffner) projecting inward from the inner surface of the jacket (re claim 3), the spline being continuously extending on the inner surface of the jacket (re claims 4 and 13), the spline extending along a longitudinal axis of the core (re claims 5 and 14), the at

least one spline comprising four splines projecting inward from the inner surface of the jacket (re claims 7, 8, 16 and 17), the spline projecting radially inwardly from the inner surface of the jacket (re claims 9 and 18), the twisted pairs not being separated from one another by the spline (the spline being short) (re claims 10 and 19), the core filler being round (re claim 11), the at least one spline comprising a plurality of splines (re claim 12), and the splines being equally spaced about the core (re claim 20). Re claims 6 and 15, it has been held that the patentability of a product claim is determined by the novelty and nonobviousness of the claimed product itself without consideration of the process, extruded, for making it which is recited in the claim. In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10 and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau N Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-1980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 31. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Chau N Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2831